

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed July 14, 2005 has been reviewed and carefully considered.

Claims 1-7 are pending.

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roop et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,619,274) in view of the Program and System Information Protocol for Terrestrial Broadcast and Cable document (ATSC document).

In rejecting independent claim 1, the Examiner states "Roop also discloses the processor initiates said user selected processing based upon said second time-of-day clock." In making this rejection, the examiner seems to suggest that the daylight savings correction referred to in Roop is somehow analogous to applicant's claimed second time-of-day clock. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of Roop et al. in this respect. Roop et al. neither discloses nor suggest the use of a second time-of-day clock as shown and described by the present invention.

Throughout applicant's specification, it is clear that the current time reference information is derived from the SST data of the MPEG compliant data stream, which stream includes a time reference indicator and associated correction data. This "correction data" is referred to in the specification of the present invention as daylight savings time indicators and offset information adjusting for time drift, leap years, etc. (See page 6, lines 9-39). Thus, the second time-of-day clock of applicant's invention is not at all related to the daylight savings correction referred to in Roop et al. and as set forth by the Examiner. For this reason alone, Roop et al. taken singly or in combination with any of the

cited references fails to anticipate or render the present invention obvious. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicant's second time-of-day clock is different from the scheduling clock and is generated to prevent time change discontinuities that occur in the scheduling clock from being display and from disturbing the user. (See Page 14, lines 5-15). Furthermore, Roop et al. does not disclose, teach or even suggest that the processor provide a second time-of-day clock based on the received current time information. As such, Roop et al. taken singly or in any combination with the ATSC Document, does not disclose or suggest the processor initiating the user selected processing function based upon the second time-of-day clock.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of the claims set forth in the Office Action of July 14, 2005 be withdrawn, that pending claims 1-7 be allowed, and that the case proceed to early issuance of Letters Patent in due course.

It is believed that no additional fees or charges are currently due. However, in the event that any additional fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the application, they may be charged to applicant's Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

DANIEL R. SCHNEIDEWEND, ET AL.

By:


Jeffrey M. Navon
Registration No. 32,711

6

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312,
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

October 20, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the
USPTO to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on the date shown below:

October 20, 2005
Date


Linda Tindall